

SOUTH DAVIS COUNTY TRANSIT DEIS

Woods Cross Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3 - Summary

Project:

South Davis County Transit DEIS

Meeting Purpose:

Woods Cross Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3

Meeting

4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

August 23, 2007

Location:

Woods Cross City Hall

Attendee

Angelo Papastamos

Kerry Doane

Kim Clark

Jacqueline Jensen

Saffron Capson

Colleen Lavery

Robin Hutcheson

Anne Blankenship

Ruth Payne

Tim Stephens (representative)

Charlie Payne

Representing

UDOT

UTA

VIA

H.W. Lochner

H.W. Lochner

Carter & Burgess

Fehr & Peers

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Meeting Summary:**Process**

K. Clark began by explaining where the project currently is in the overall process. She indicated alternatives for the project are currently being evaluated. Input from the next round of sub-committee meetings will be used to accomplish this task. During the next regional workshop attendees will focus specifically on alignments. During the current meeting the focus will be on alternative modes. The Purpose and Need Statement for the study was reviewed with the group. Sub-committee members were referred to their meeting packets for full text copies of all of the meeting materials..

Regional Workshop Recap

K. Clark recapped the exercise conducted at the second Regional Workshop which focused on origins/destinations, alignments, and the identification of modes. A map of the primary and secondary alignments identified at the Regional Workshop was shown to the group.

Universe of Alternatives

K. Clark explained what the “universe of alternatives” entailed and the Universe of Alignments map was shown. Sub-committee members were then taken through the two components to an alternative (alignment and mode).

Alignments

A map of preliminary alignments being taken through the alternatives analysis process was shown to sub-committee members as the study's preliminary "long list alignments." K. Clark reviewed the criteria used to narrow down alignments.

Modes

Next, a "universe of modes" list was reviewed with the sub-committee members. As with alignment narrowing criteria, mode narrowing criteria was discussed. The preliminary "long list of modes" was outlined by K. Clark. The list was divided into two categories – bus and rail.

Factors to Consider

K. Clark defined factors to consider when comparing modes. Factors included market, capacity, operating characteristics, costs, environmental/community considerations, and access. After each factor was reviewed, a "dot game" exercise was conducted to determine which three factors are most important to each sub-committee member in considering modes. The following is a list of factors identified by the Woods Cross sub-committee members as most important when considering modes:

Category	Factors	Number of Dots
Market	Local trips are important.	4
	Commuter trips are important.	0
Capacity		0
Operating Characteristics	It should stop frequently.	4
	Minimal travel time.	0
Costs		1
Environmental/Community Considerations	It needs to sit within the context of my community.	1
	It needs to allow for good traffic flow.	0
Access	It needs to be easy to board.	1
	I need to be able to get to it easily.	1

Long List Modes

R. Hutcheson outlined each mode in the preliminary long list of modes, including giving a description and typical characteristics based on how the mode has been implemented in other communities in the United States. After each mode was discussed, the group participated in an exercise to determine the "pros" and "cons" of implementing each mode in their community. Below is a list of pros and cons identified by Woods Cross sub-committee members.

BUS (3 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Flexible (cost, routes, size)	Less frequent
Cost/rider	Image/stigma
No right-of-way needed	Slower
	Lack of reliability

BRT – Bus Rapid Transit (0 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Can avoid incidents	Air quality
More efficient	
Commuter friendly	
Fewer stops	
Trendy	

LRT – Light Rail Transit (1 Dot)	
Pro	Con
Can go longer distances	Cost
Better serve off-peak users	Requires good bus service or people won't use it because they can't get where they are going
Familiarity	

Streetcar (0Dots)	
Pro	Con
Visually attractive	Not a population to support it
May draw riders	Doesn't serve Woods Cross (probably)
	Tear up streets
	Cost prohibitive
	Construction
	Not flexible on fixed route

DMU – Diesel Mobile Unit (0 Dots)	
Pro	Con
Lower cost (rail exists already)	Doesn't serve east side
More convenient trip to downtown for local residents	More trains on commuter rail track (blocking intersections)
	Noise, access, safety
	Doesn't help with east/west traffic
	Limited possible stations

Future Meetings

The next sub-committee meeting will be held on October 18th from 4:00–6:00 p.m.

Any discrepancies with this meeting summary, please notify Jacqueline Jensen.

Cc: Attendees, Project Contact List, Woods Cross Sub-Committee Members